

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PENDLETON DIVISION

MARK E. PUCKETT,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:11-cv-6250-SU

**OPINION AND ORDER ADOPTING
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Max Rae, P.O. Box 7790, Salem, OR 97303-0175. Attorney for Plaintiff.

S. Amanda Marshall, United States Attorney, and Adrian L. Brown, Assistant United States Attorney, 1000 SW Third Avenue, Suite 600, Portland, OR 97201-2902. Benjamin J. Groebner, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Office of General Counsel, Social Security Administration, 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900 M/S 221A, Seattle, WA 98104-7075. Attorneys for Defendant.

SIMON, District Judge.

On February 13, 2013, Magistrate Judge Patricia Sullivan filed Findings and Recommendations in this case. Dkt. 25. Judge Sullivan recommended that Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney Fees, Dkt. 21, should be granted in part and denied in part. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, the court may "accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If, however, no objections are filed, the Magistrates Act does not prescribe any standard of review. In such cases, “[t]here is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Magistrates Act] intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report[.]” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en banc*) (court must review *de novo* magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although in the absence of objections no review is required, the Magistrates Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No objections having been made, the court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Magistrate Judge Sullivan’s findings and recommendations for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Sullivan’s Findings and Recommendation, Dkt. 25.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 25th day of March, 2013.

/s/ Michael H. Simon

Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge